

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 27 are pending in the Patent Application.

Claims 1 – 4, 6 – 11, 13 – 17, 19 – 24, 26 and 27 are rejected.

Claims 5, 12, 18 and 25 are objected to.

For the claims that have not been canceled by this Amendment, Applicant has attempted to correct the informality that “invention” is inappropriately used in those claims, by substituting the word “system” therefore, as recommended by Examiner.

The amendment to Claims 7 and 27 (as renumbered herein), by substituting “said circuit” for “said microcircuit” as suggested by Examiner, should overcome the objection thereto regarding this informality.

Claim 21 has been amended herein by substituting a comma for a semicolon, as suggested by Examiner.

Claims 23 – 28, as filed, which claims were originally incorrectly numbered, have been renumbered herein.

Claims 2, 9 and 22 (as renumbered herein) are objected to under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the definition of “actuating means” and “actuator” to be of “a ground crew” which essentially stipulates that the claims do not require performance of the steps by a machine. Claims 2, 9 and 22 (as renumbered herein) have been amended to delete “a ground crew” from the recitation of said claims. Reconsideration of this objection is requested.

Examiner states that Claims 5, 12, 18, and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has rewritten Claim 5 by incorporating the features of Claim 5 into independent Claim 1; there are no intervening claims. Consequently, Claim 1 should be in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 3, and 4, as amended herein, each depending (directly or indirectly) from allowable Claim 1, and each respectively reciting additional features thereto, should also be in condition for allowance. Claim 6 has been canceled by this Amendment, so that the rejection

thereof is deemed moot. Claim 7, as amended herein, depending from allowable Claim 1 and reciting additional features thereto, should be in condition for allowance.

Claim 12 has been rewritten by incorporating the features of Claim 12 into independent Claim 8; there are no intervening claims. Therefore, Claim 8 should be in condition for allowance. Claims 9, 10, and 11, as amended herein, each depending (directly or indirectly) from allowable Claim 8, and each respectively reciting additional features thereto, should also be in condition for allowance. Claim 13 has been canceled by this Amendment, so that the rejection thereof is deemed moot. Claim 17, as amended herein, depending from allowable Claim 15 and reciting additional features thereto, should also be in condition for allowance.

Claim 26 (now numbered Claim 25) has been rewritten by incorporating the features of said claim into independent Claim 21; there are no intervening claims. Thusly, Claim 21 should be in condition for allowance. Moreover, Claim 23 (now numbered Claim 22), Claim 24 (now numbered Claim 23) and Claim 24, each depending (directly or indirectly) upon allowable Claim 21, and each respectively reciting additional features thereto, should be in condition for allowance. Claims 27 (now numbered Claim 26) has been canceled by this Amendment, and rejection thereof is deemed moot. Claim 28 (now numbered Claim 27) depending from allowable Claim 21 and reciting additional features thereto, should also be in condition for allowance.

Applicants request that Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 22 (as renumbered herein), 23 (as renumbered herein), 24, and 27 (as renumbered herein) be allowed and that the case pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 30,021


Leonard A. Alkov, Attorney for Applicant

Tel. No. 310.647.2577
Fax No. 310.647.2616

Raytheon Company
P.O. Box 902 (E4/N119)
El Segundo, CA 90245-0902